

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 33470

STATE OF IDAHO,	)	2009 Unpublished Opinion No. 571
	)	
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)	Filed: August 18, 2009
	)	
v.	)	Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
	)	
KYLE HANSEN GREENE,	)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
	)	OPINION AND SHALL NOT
Defendant-Appellant.	)	BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
	)	

---

Appeal from the District Court of the Sixth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Franklin County. Hon. Don L. Harding, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years, for felony injury to a child, affirmed; order denying I.C.R. 35 motion for reduction of sentence, affirmed.

Molly J. Huskey, State Appellate Public Defender; Sarah E. Tompkins, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Lori A. Fleming, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

---

Before LANSING, Chief Judge; PERRY, Judge;  
and GRATTON, Judge

---

PER CURIAM

Kyle Hansen Greene pled guilty to felony injury to a child. Idaho Code § 18-1501. The district court sentenced Greene to a unified term of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years. Greene filed an Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motion, which the district court denied. Greene appeals asserting that the district court abused its discretion by imposing an excessive sentence and by denying his Rule 35 motion.

Sentencing is a matter for the trial court's discretion. Both our standard of review and the factors to be considered in evaluating the reasonableness of the sentence are well established. *See State v. Hernandez*, 121 Idaho 114, 117-18, 822 P.2d 1011, 1014-15 (Ct. App. 1991); *State*

*v. Lopez*, 106 Idaho 447, 449-51, 680 P.2d 869, 871-73 (Ct. App. 1984); *State v. Toohill*, 103 Idaho 565, 568, 650 P.2d 707, 710 (Ct. App. 1982). When reviewing the length of a sentence, we consider the defendant's entire sentence. *State v. Oliver*, 144 Idaho 722, 726, 170 P.3d 387, 391 (2007). Applying these standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion.

The parties stipulated to re-entry of judgment for purposes of restarting the period in which Greene may appeal his conviction. Although the State contends that Greene should not be able to appeal the denial of his Rule 35 motion, it is unclear whether Greene believed that the stipulation also allowed appeal from the Rule 35 motion. Therefore, we will entertain the merits of the appeal of the Rule 35 motion.

A motion for reduction of sentence under I.C.R. 35 is essentially a plea for leniency, addressed to the sound discretion of the court. *State v. Knighton*, 143 Idaho 318, 319, 144 P.3d 23, 24 (2006); *State v. Allbee*, 115 Idaho 845, 846, 771 P.2d 66, 67 (Ct. App. 1989). In presenting a Rule 35 motion, the defendant must show that the sentence is excessive in light of new or additional information subsequently provided to the district court in support of the motion. *State v. Huffman*, 144 Idaho 201, 203, 159 P.3d 838, 840 (2007). In conducting our review of the grant or denial of a Rule 35 motion, we consider the entire record and apply the same criteria used for determining the reasonableness of the original sentence. *State v. Forde*, 113 Idaho 21, 22, 740 P.2d 63, 64 (Ct. App. 1987); *Lopez*, 106 Idaho at 449-51, 680 P.2d at 871-73. Upon review of the record, we conclude no abuse of discretion has been shown.

Therefore, Greene's judgment of conviction and sentence, and the district court's order denying Greene's Rule 35 motion, are affirmed.